UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Modern Skepticism: How Meet It? - - - - - - - - *George E. O'Dell*

Monotheism Versus Monohumanism - - - - - - - - *Robert Whitaker*

Tried in the Balance - - *Arthur D. Weage*

TRUMPETS ON NEW HORIZONS

VOLUME CXXVI NUMBER 2

Chicago, September 16, 1940

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Publication Committee

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, Chairman
MRS E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-Chairman
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 19

ARTICLES—
Modern Skepticism: How Meet It?—GEORGE E. O'DELL 22
Monotheism Versus Monohumanism—ROBERT WHITAKER 25
Tried in the Balance—ARTHUR D. WEAGE 26
On the Pacifist Front—XXII 28

TRUMPETS ON NEW HORIZONS—
September, 1939-1940—?—DOROTHY E. SPARKS 29
Singer, Ease the Heart!—IRENE KIRBY SURENSON 29
Rise!—HENRY GEORGE WEISS 29
The Amazing Plan—NATALIE T. MORRIS 29

POETRY—
New Prophet—JANIE SMITH RHYNE 21

THE STUDY TABLE—
The Real Roosevelt—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 30
Psalms in Modern Dress—RALPH CHEYNEY 31
Book Notes by CHARLES A. HAWLEY 31

THE FIELD—
Saving British Children—By HELEN FISHER 18
A Statement—*A. C. L. U. Bulletin* 32

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Saving British Children
By Helen Fisher

In the face of constantly spreading war destruction, famine, and homeless sufferers in Asia and Europe, American philanthropic societies have found themselves reaping rich harvests of sympathy, but in practical terms have encountered steadily diminishing returns, as the scant million dollars collected by the Finnish campaign testifies. Whatever the cause may be—growing callousness before repetitions of the same stories of tragedy, preoccupation with want at home—the fact remains that in comparison with the two hundred million dollars poured into Europe during the first World War by the Y. M. C. A. alone, Americans, at least until a short time ago, have been reacting quite differently to the plight of sufferers in this conflict.

But suddenly, characteristically, America has come alive to one impending tragedy and reacted to it with thrilling generosity—the plight of the children in Great Britain. As some one put it the other day—"After all, the Poles, the Scandinavians, even the French still had somewhere to go when their country was overrun, but these poor youngsters are trapped—only the sea can save them!" Perhaps too there is a vague feeling that removing these children from danger may help procure a British victory.

Although receiving the backing of many prominent national leaders, including energetic, red-tape-cutting Eleanor Roosevelt, the movement is fundamentally something spontaneous and genuine, springing from the hearts of its sponsors and needing no official prodding. Responding to the cry of thousands from all parts of the country who seem to have had the same idea at once—to get the children out of Britain—the organization leaped into being to translate popular clamor into action. It is a result, not a cause, and from the very first has been besieged by crowds begging for their services even before they could be efficiently organized.

The colossal task of marshalling into effective action all this powerful but scattered good will has fallen to the United States Committee for the Care of European Children, 215 Fourth Avenue, New York. In its first five weeks of existence the Committee has registered offers of some 20,000 homes, formed nearly 200 local committees, and organized a staff of more than 200 workers. It is an incorporated organization, with Marshall Field as Chairman, Mrs. Roosevelt as Honorary Chairman, and a collection of other well-known persons as active patrons. It is assisted by an impressive group of coöperating organizations, notably the International Migration Service, which has loaned practically its entire staff for full-time work with the Committee.

(*Continued on page* 32)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXVI MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 1940 No. 2

THE MUDDLE OF MORALS

The muddle of the democracies comes from something deeper than their form of government; it comes from the gradually accelerated destruction of all convictions about the nature of man and his destiny: convictions which attach human beings to something greater than themselves and cause them to care for something more lasting than the moment in which they live. For how can this planet be governed by people who have ceased to believe that there is good and that there is evil, that there are obligations which cannot be denied; who insist, often with a show of learning, that what is most convenient is right and what is most pleasing to hear is true, or at least as true as anything can or needs to be.

Democracy cannot be made to work by people who think it enlightened to be cynical, grasping, concerned with the expediency of the moment and contemptuous of all standards which transcend it. There is not enough intelligence or character in this way of life to govern a nation successfully. For democracy was founded by men who had the conviction that there is truth and that there is good and evil; it was never meant for men who reject this view of life, and in so far, and it is now very far, as the democracies have fallen into disbelief and unfaith, they are in a desperately dangerous muddle about everything that matters most to themselves and their children.

Walter Lippman, in the New York *Herald-Tribune.*

WAR—AND HUMANITY!

The war in Europe and the impending starvation of European peoples have thrown into stark naked reality the terribleness of war. The whole situation has been dramatized, and thus brought to the forefront of public attention, by Herbert Hoover's program for the feeding of the populations of Belgium and other dependent countries conquered by Germany. From the standpoint of humanity, there is no denying the Hoover proposal. It is elementary, if there is anything like pity in the world, that the hunger-stricken multitudes of Europe should be fed. What say the Scriptures?—"I was anhungered; and ye gave me meat"; *** "If thine enemy hunger, feed him." On the other hand, from the standpoint of war, and England's victory in this war, there is no denying Churchill's statement that the blockade cannot and will not be lifted. If the conquered populations are fed, that means just so much more food for Germany. If the conquered populations are not fed, they will die, fester in disease, arise in wild revolt, and therewith hasten the downfall of the Reich. Food sent to the continent, no matter for whom intended, is a contribution to German victory, and therefore food must be stopped. Hoover, speaking for humanity, is right; Churchill, speaking for Britain fighting for her life, is right; and Churchill, having military force at his disposal, will prevail. It is in such a dilemma as this that we are made to see what war is—itself the utter denial of civilization, culture, morality, religion, humanity, all the fine things distinctive of the higher life of man, for the sake of which, we are told, this war is being fought. Of course war cannot be fought for these things; in the very nature of the case, it must be fought for starvation, pestilence, misery, death, destruction to the end of all that makes earth fair and man wonderful. If we are going to consent to war, we are going to consent to every vile, ferocious, and inhumane thing which lies within the compass of man's horrid power; and we ourselves, if we be sincere, are going to do these things. We cannot excuse ourselves by sending off somebody else to do the killing, after the example of Congressmen passing conscription bills; we cannot blame governments for starving innocent and helpless populations. *We* are doing the killing, and *we* are starving the women and children crying out for bread. Defend it who will. We can't!

AGAIN, THE SAME OLD WAR!

From the beginning of this war, UNITY has contended that the conflict is nothing more nor less than a continuation of the last war, and has drawn from this fact the conclusion that it is basically an imperialistic struggle for world mastery, with which America should have nothing to do. If we made a mistake, as we all agree, in going into the last war, why should we now repeat this mistake when this war is only the last war started up all over again? For this assertion UNITY has been roundly abused. The logic of our argument is deemed sound enough, but our premise is disputed on the plea that this war is something different—a fresh, new struggle to save civilization from barbarism. But suddenly we find that UNITY is not alone in this analysis of the world's disaster. Thus, some weeks ago, the New York *Herald Tribune,* a thoroughgoing pro-war paper, declared in a leading editorial that "the present war is only a continuation of the war which was started on that fateful August morning in 1914" (see UNITY, July 15th, page 147). Now comes an even more startling pronouncement of this truth—from none other than the Hon. Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of the British Empire. Speaking before the

House of Commons on August 21st last, he said: ". . . *this war is, in fact, only a continuation of the last.*" Mr. Churchill went on to describe "great differences in its character"—the weapons and tactics used, the number of men slain, etc. But there was neither dispute nor qualification of the fact that it is the same old war. So, with renewed confidence, we reaffirm our judgment that America should keep out of this war. We know now, what we did not know twenty-five years ago, what this same old war really is. It is now proven on the books of history, written in the secret treaties and sealed in the Versailles Treaty, that this war of 1914 was a struggle not to end war, least of all to make the world safe for democracy, but to establish military and political dominance as between two great empires, Britain and Germany. This war, ended for a time, has started up again. Are we going to be fooled again? O, yes—we may be! But not if we keep our heads and remember the truth as proclaimed by the warriors themselves: ". . . only a continuation of the last war"! Thanks for letting us know! Now we know what to do—and what *not* to do!

CONSCRIPTION—AND CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

In our August 19th issue (pages 180-1), we commented upon the conscientious objector's problem in relation to the pending peacetime conscription bill. We reported that, in the original version of the bill, the provision for conscientious objectors was exceedingly inadequate, since it recognized only those who are members of "any well-recognized religious sect whose creed or principles forbid its members to participate in war in any form." It is gratifying now to report the improvement made in this regard in the later version of the measure. As the matter stands now, at this writing, conscientious objectors are exempted from military service on their own merit as individuals; see this clause:

> "Nothing in this act shall be construed to require any person to be subject to combatant training or service . . . who, by reason of religious training and belief, is conscientiously opposed to participation in war in any form."

Those claiming exemption under this provision must prove their character and good faith before local boards set up by the Department of Justice, which is only right and proper, though the problem of passing on the sincerity of individual conscience still remains one of the unsolved problems of ethical jurisprudence. Another excellent provision of the bill is the offering to the sincere conscientious objector of "work of national importance under civilian control," if he objects to alternative non-combatant service. Summing up the whole law on this question of conscientious objectors, we find these advantages: objectors are recognized; they are classified on a separate list; they are rated on the basis of individual religious conviction, as contrasted with sectarian membership; they are heard and judged by a civilian board; they are offered not only non-combatant service, but, if they object to this, civilian service; and they are granted, equally with the government, the right of appeal on any disputed point. All this is to the good! Yet the bill still remains woefully unsatisfactory in the fact that it recognizes only *religious* conscientious objectors. There are other objectors, quite as sincere, oftentimes more intelligent in their understanding of war, whose conviction is based on secular rather than spiritual grounds. These should not be ignored. Also, it must be said that, whatever the provisions of the law, much depends upon its administration, as was tragically proven in the last war. Legal martinets, patrioteers, and sadists may work havoc with any law. (See the full text of the law, as passed by the Senate, in the "On the Pacifist Front" column in this issue.)

THE THIRD TERM—AND THOMAS JEFFERSON

Since the third-term question is bound to be a central issue in this campaign, and Thomas Jefferson, historic founder and leader of the Democratic Party, is being quoted *pro* and *con,* it may be well to set forth plainly what the great Jefferson's attitude really was. First of all, of course, there is the fact that Jefferson declined a third term, as did George Washington before him and Andrew Jackson after him. Next, in the earlier portion of his career, when the Constitution was being written in Philadelphia and he was abroad in France, Jefferson argued earnestly in his correspondence against what he called "the perpetual re-eligibility" of the president. Again, in his late old age, when in his autobiography he pondered his own experience in relation to the nation's history, he wrote that

> "the example of four Presidents voluntarily retiring at the end of their eighth year, and the progress of public opinion that the principle is salutary, have given it in practice the force of precedent and usage; insomuch that, should a President consent to be a candidate for a third election, I trust he would be rejected on this demonstration of ambitious views."

It is true that once Jefferson seems to have conceded the fact of an "emergency" as affecting the presidential tenure of office, but "emergency" fits the present Rooseveltian situation much less cogently than "this demonstration of ambitious views." The President has masked his ambition in pleas of "indispensability." He alone is competent to steer the ship of state through stormy waters—a confession of the bankruptcy of democracy more sinister than anything ever said by Hitler and Mussolini who hate democracy! As a matter of fact, the President is *not* indispensable; he is simply "ambitious" to run things some more, to lead this nation through war to peace, above all to sit at the peace table and refashion the world. This ambition may be legitimate or illegitimate—it is certainly courageous after the Wilson experience! But it does not make the President indispensable, nor does it affect the issue of the third term. We keep on wishing that

the President had not messed up this third-term business with his hypocritical nonsense about longing to retire and accepting nomination for a third time only because he was "drafted" and had to respond. Had he stated frankly his ambition and appealed to the people on that basis, we would have had an honest issue, and a clean-cut opportunity to decide, à la Jefferson, whether the third-term tradition is important to us today.

SIR OLIVER LODGE

The late Sir Oliver Lodge, dead on August 22nd last, was beloved, eminent, and popularly famous. He was beloved as one of the most genial, generous, friendly, and tolerant men of his time. He was eminent as a scientist of authority and true creative genius. He was popularly famous as one of the most active and convinced inquirers into the problem of survival after death and communication with the dead. In this field of psychical research, as it is called, Sir Oliver, like his friend and associate, Sir A. Conan Doyle, was influential not so much because of any original methods which he contributed to the work or any distinctive evidence which he adduced, as because of his own great personal renown. His book, *Raymond,* telling of his communications with his son who was killed in the last war, made a profound impression, first because of its exquisitely tender revelation of Sir Oliver's love for his boy and the beautiful relation between father and son, secondly because of its demonstration of the unshakeable faith of one of the most distinguished scientists of the day in personal immortality, but only incidentally because of any intrinsic evidence contained in its pages of survival after death. As a scientist, Sir Oliver Lodge maintained the great succession of men from Sir Isaac Newton down who have done more to make England glorious than all the deeds of all her soldiers. His researches and achievements were made in realms of inquiry which few lay minds can penetrate or even understand. But we can all appreciate his brilliant work in the field of radio. Every time we listen to mysterious voices of air, to music coming from afar, we are profiting from Lodge's work. It is not strange, perhaps, that one who contributed so much to communication between living persons in this world should have insisted upon communication with persons dead in this world but living in the next! In addition to his strictly scientific work, Sir Oliver Lodge won place in the field of philosophy. Thus, his little book, entitled *Continuity,* ranks among the outstanding philosophical essays of our time. Perhaps this man was most remarkable for the variety of his talents and the wide compass of his interests. The power, range and originality of his thought were unexcelled by that of any other figure of his generation. The richness of his personality was unique. The light of his eye and the love of his heart crowned him with the adoration of his contemporaries. He was a great and good man—and now one of the immortals!

SUMMER BROODINGS

We have been spending the summer at a lovely little beach on the coast of Maine. This spot is blessed by the benediction of earth, and sea, and sky. It is perfect—if it were not for the people who infest it! Some of the people, at least! Most of the men and women at this beach desire quiet, worship loveliness, are orderly, cultured, mutually considerate. But the others —the pestiferous minority!! What are we to think of the woman who brings a portable radio to the beach, and, surrounded by a hundred persons who are reading, chatting, or sleeping, turns on the latest swing band for all to hear? That woman makes us understand Hitler and his idea of concentration camps. * * * What right has a man to own a speed-boat, and in mid-afternoon, when silence broods even on the moving waters of the deep, to run the machine up and down the shore with a racket that can be heard for miles? Is the shooting squad good enough for him? * * * Then there is the man who chooses the quiet beach, and the company of resting people, to read aloud—*very* loud!—to his wife. Why not put these two bores in solitary confinement and let them read together to their hearts' content? * * * Also, there is the man who smokes a cigarette when he goes in bathing. Of course, the cigarette has one supreme virtue. It makes no noise! But it has the vice of being "dope"—and here it is at its worst. This smoking bather we would gladly consign to one of the lower circles of Dante's Inferno. There he could *smoke!* * * * Then there is the man, or woman, who uses the automobile horn to attract the attention of a distant friend, or to send him a message. This offender is as obnoxious at the seashore as on the city street, and should be hanged as high as Haman. * * * And what shall we say of those who litter the place with rubbish—throw a cigarette-butt here, a lunch box there, and leave the Sunday newspaper to blow about everywhere? These persons we would make street-cleaners for life. * * * As for the nude, or semi-nude, bather!! Our objection, be it said, is not primarily moral—we see no indecency in the human body! Rather is it *aesthetic!!* This body, nine times out of ten, is too ugly to be borne. Also there was an old virtue known as modesty, now superseded by exhibitionism, which we miss. * * * Was the hymn-writer right when he referred to a world where

> "Every prospect pleases,
> And only man is vile"?

New Prophet

The preacher's words were blades that ripped
Ungodly dogmas, slashed and stripped
Away a shroud. And now is freed
A virile Christ, alive to lead.

JANIE SMITH RHYNE.

Modern Skepticism: How Meet It?

GEORGE E. O'DELL*

Is skepticism, modern or earlier, necessarily a bad thing, that we must speak of "meeting it"? A partial answer is to be found in the investigations made concerning religious psychology. There is a "line of growth" in religious experience. Young people brought up in religious homes, and attending denominational colleges, might be expected to escape religious doubt. But they do not. Starbuck in his *Psychology of Religion* showed how among such subjects of inquiry at least half the young women and two-thirds of the young men pass through a very definite and sometimes painful period of skepticism concerning what they learned in church or Sunday school, or "at their mother's knee." It is clear that here we meet with mental growing-pains. Besides, childish concepts may have to be rethought. Just as we rethink our parents, so we may have to arrive at mature ideas about religion. Skepticism, then, is among the means by which at any rate some minds must continue to grow.

But there is more than this. The doubters among the serious young people we have been discussing—and in whom questioning may have been started by scientific reading, or by unanswered prayers, or the conduct of known "believers" showing inconsistencies with their belief, and what not—are frequently likely in these days to put many of their childhood's beliefs on the shelf, as impossible either to prove or disprove, and to turn to ideals of conduct as a "way out." Many people today are wholeheartedly living by commitments and consecrations at which they would not have arrived as deep personal convictions if they had not begun by questioning what life means, and whether one or another dogma or myth of religion is an adequate explanation of it.

Next let us note that skepticism has been one of the greatest forces making for religious advance. New ideas have to challenge old ones in order to gain adoption. Religion and ethics are intertwined, and all real progress in religion is ethical. There is a process called "development" in religion; though it is not generally recognized that this, like a religion itself, may be either a good thing or a bad thing. Has the line of development in, say, Christianity, necessarily from the beginning been good and not bad? The beautiful spiritual sayings, and sublime life, of Jesus are succeeded by the tortuous theology of Paul. The democratic simplicity of the early church is succeeded by the religious fascism of the fourth century, which has lasted to our own day, and by the persecutions and tortures of the Middle Ages, and the horrible intolerances and cruelties, in the name of religion, which are rampant even in our own time. Yes, there has been bad development in religion as well as good. And the good has been ethical —a challenging of blind or half-blind concepts by ideas deeper-seeing, and illuminating the darkness of the world.

Once upon a time, in the name of the gods, an injured man cried vengeance against not only his injurer, but all his enemy's relations and tribal friends. It was a tremendous challenge which instead declared "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth"—a challenge of skepticism as regards the older notion of right. You find it in the great Babylonian Code of Hammurabi, whence obviously the Hebrews (to their credit) adopted it. Jesus doubted the human worth even of this immense juristic advance, and proclaimed a nobler doctrine. Or take the unquestioning acceptance of early current sociological fact in the statement of the Decalogue that "God" will visit the sins of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation —and it is thus still repeated in churches, and often enough acted upon in daily life. But the later Prophets, skeptics as to the moral worth of the Commandment, fiercely challenge it, and declare that the day shall come when a man "shall die for his own iniquity" alone. It is only by denying "ancient good" in the name of better insight that there can be a good "development" in religion.

It has been said that "man has made God in his own image." The cynic who declared so was not really cynical enough. The truth is rather that man has thought of God in terms ten times worse than would apply to himself. If, for instance, there be a man alive today, among the many fiendish workers of darkness in Europe, who would be capable of hanging over the Golden Bar of Heaven throughout the eternal ages, glorying in the tortures of the damned below, with a God alongside him who condemned these victims to their fate even before they were born, do we not know that such a man would not really be human but would be a madman and his God a devil? Yet it took an enormous and shuddering skepticism to discard just such teachings—so far as, mercifully, they have been discarded—there are still millions of believers in eternal torment as the punishment for wrongdoing. How has the discarding come about? Three great forces have tended to foster skepticism as to just such ideas as those concerning Hell. One is Science, another is Humanitarianism—helped indeed by what is best in the received religions—and the growing Spirit of Democracy. In particular let us look at the influence of science. Science has been called the "False Messiah." But this is to cloud the issue. Science is simply the collection of facts and the effort to arrange them according to their connections and perhaps discover relationships that are fundamental in character. The applications of science are not science. And the speculations of scientific investigators—often about abstract matters outside their own fields—are not science. But the spread of modern concepts of causation, just as they helped indirectly to eliminate the belief in witchcraft—except perhaps in the form of "malicious animal magnetism"—have also helped, in the case of the more civilized sort of people, to force the notion of everlasting torment backward, carrying with it much other lumber of our religious past.

Some of us doubtless can recall being planted in childhood on some elder's knee and told how, if we did not relinquish childish pranks, we would surely on a Day of Judgment find our elders standing on the right side of the Almighty and ourselves going the other way, and, perhaps, for one or another of us, the prospect was not wholly unalluring! My own people presently had the good fortune to be converted to a better religious development by the preaching of that brave and humane clergyman, Frederick William Farrar,

*A Leader in the Ethical Culture Societies, and Editor of the *Standard*.—*Editor*.

whose incumbency of the Parliament church in London drew great throngs of lords and commoners to hear the new doctrine (comforting to statesmen and politicians) that there is no Hell. Farrar's open and genuinely catholic mind made him an innovator in many ways. For instance, he kept a magnificently upholstered pew to which the ushers on spotting American visitors at once conducted them. And on one of the ancient walls, crowded with monumental tributes to the great, he set up in a spare space a marble tablet in memory of the greatest of Germans, Goethe. When, after the World War, I revisited the scene of my childhood's churchgoing, to my discomfort I found this tablet gone. Doubtless in the war years some clerical vandal had removed it. I missed it the more because I had memorized four lines of verse—I know not by whom—carved upon it. For fifty years they have stayed in my mind, and they are much to our purpose. I quote them now:

> Thy prayer was light, more light, while time shall last.
> Thou sawest a radiance growing in the night,
> But not the shadows which that light would cast
> Till shadows vanish in the Light of Light.

Now, Goethe's "light" was science, and of course the composer of these lines, in the last of them, was talking about God. But what truth there is in the presentation, insofar as the increase of science has been accompanied by an increase in the shadows! The applications of science have not all made for human welfare. One thinks not only of health and longevity, of cleanliness, comfort, and varied living: also there are the great guns, the bombers, the battleships, the submarines, the explosive mines. Yet we must not attribute these to science. Science is light, and light does not cast shadows. Light casts only light. Shadows are cast by the opaque and stubborn bodies that get in the way of the light. Science floods with light; it is the crass and benighted statesman, the "merchant of death," the exploiter of invention and machinery who cares more for profits than for men; it is the preacher of outworn religious and social creeds—these it is that cast shadows. And the day of God in the scientific sense, the day of the Light of Light, will be the day when science has penetrated even the most resistant of obstructive objects, and illumined the darkest corners of mind and body, of nature and human nature, of religion and ethics, so that the area of shadow is no more. That is indeed a "far off divine event," but it is in faith in it that the modern skeptic, made so by science, lives. For science is half skepticism, never satisfied that its truth is the whole truth, devoted only to the persistent effort to cast more light.

Turning now to the influence of Humanitarianism and the Democratic Spirit, both inspired by pity and the sense of individual worth and potentiality, we must look at the idea companionate to Hell, that of Heaven. Has not that also declined under the influence of modern skepticism? Strange to say (yet not so strange) it is not the happy in this world who are most concerned as to whether they will live again. It is not the scientists, the artists, the great teachers of youth; they for the most part have such contentment in their vocation they concentrate on that, not anxious for proof of everlasting personal survival. It is the unhappy who more often crave passionately the "second chance." And in the course of its "development" religion has held the hope out to them with both hands. I have spoken of Farrar; now let me quote from another ecclesiastic of the Anglican Church, Bishop Welldon, once Headmaster of Harrow, one of those English endowed schools to which the sons of the rich go in order to be fitted for membership in their country's governing class. The passage I shall read is at least forty years old, but it is typical of the way even kind and gentle men—the bishop was one such—have been used to think about the "social problem," the problem of rich and poor. In a widely-circulated book called *The Hope of Immortality,* Welldon said:

> It cannot, I think, be proved, but neither can it be denied, that the social and political movements, indicating in many European countries a discontent and an impatience which are dangerous signs of the times, are largely the outcome of the speculations which have taught men, in the name of Philosophy and Science, or any other name, to cast away the restraining power of belief in God. Certainly, it is remarkable that discontent or impatience in its most pronounced form, is equally intolerant and contemptuous of authority, human and divine. And, indeed, if the faith of the people in God and Immortality is done away, and their privations, their labors, their sufferings remain, is it reasonable to think that they will acquiesce in an inequality which was always hard to bear, and is now felt to be hopeless, because it fills the whole span of their existence?

That is, unconsciously, a terrible passage. It reminds me of my first academic experience in London. I attended evening courses in English Language and Literature at Kings College. A permanent course in Divinity was offered to all students free of charge. I sat in at it on the opening evening of a semester, and later reported the Divinity lesson at home. The good dean who taught had taken a passage from Isaiah which, he declared, demonstrated how the poorer a man may be here, or the greater his physical hardships, the greater would be his compensation hereafter. "Young man," said my home folk, "that's enough. No more divinity for you!" And, indeed, I sought no more. But the memory remains, and also of those words of Welldon's copied out in my youth and kept as a reminder of what not to believe. "Inequality"—that gentle euphemism for untellable horrors, the horrors of slavery, of serfdom, of early industrialism, of today's insecurity and dread. What heaven could make up for it all? The advancing tide of social consciousness, of the sense of responsibility to help make a better world, released in part by benignant and emancipated Christians themselves, the rise of trades-unionism, of Labor parties, of a constructive Liberalism, all these inevitably have come about in part because of an ethical skepticism which refused to believe any longer in barbarous conceptions either of man or of God. *Why* meet it? The challenge of human reason and sympathy, persistent, from age to age, is essential to the salvation of religion, insofar as it can be a progressive function of life.

But the fact has yet to be looked in the face that modern skepticism has done more than attack beliefs about the origin and nature of the universe and the proofs of a hereafter life, thereby making an increasing number of persons humbler, less cocksure, and more tolerant of doctrinal differences. It has also eaten into our morals—as how could it not, since the teaching had so long been, and in least enlightened quarters still is, that ethics depends for validity on theology? Not every doubter reaches the conception that the reverse may be true—that a theology, doubtless very different from the anthropomorphic ones of the past, may find a metaphysical justification in moral experience. The moral experience itself, its supposed source or backing being doubted or discarded, and its origins being cast contempt upon by "scientific" speculators going far

beyond warrant, is questioned also. Why think of anything but one's own selfish gratification, why not exploit rather than "keep" one's brother, why not go the pace, disobey every law of nature and desecrate every sanctity of love—if the old religious reasons for self-respect, decency, and social responsibility no longer hold true?

Well, the first reply to be made, as to the *How,* following the *Why,* is that the Why does not retire from us even here. Moral skepticism may have its profound service to perform. A morality that is not self-subsistent is a dangerous morality. It is liable at any moment to collapse. An examined morality—as Socrates so truly saw—is the true morality. As Emerson said, we must explore goodness as to whether it *be* goodness. Let me confess to not being afraid even of such explorations as those of Bertrand Russell; I may abominate his opinions, and I may hate to think of the penalty that has to be paid for all periods of sharp transition in morals. But better the frank and even destructive discussion today of marriage and the family than the Victorian hush-hush, the stuffiness which accompanied the old loyalties, the domination of women by men, and the domination of the young by both. Let us have faith that human nature is sound at the core, and that the needs of man in society will bring into existence, out of all the strain and folly, an ethics more enlightened and digging deeper into that moral reality which surely is at the heart of things.

I have used above the expression "moral experience." And that brings me to a further illustrative quotation—one of the most moving passages in religious literature. Twice I have instanced English clergymen. This excerpt is from a third—a parish minister of the early nineteen-hundreds, Frederick W. Robertson. Doubtless it is familiar to many, but it cannot too often be repeated, that it may reach those who have not heard it before:

> It is an awful moment when the soul begins to find that the props on which it has rested are many of them wrong. . . . I know but one way in which a man can come forth from this agony scatheless. It is by holding fast to those things which are certain still. In the darkest hour through which the human soul can pass, whatever else is doubtful this at least is certain; if there be no God and no future state, even then it is better to be generous than selfish, better to be true than false, better to be brave than a coward. Blessed beyond all earthly blessedness is the man who, in the tempestuous darkness of his soul, has dared to hold fast to these landmarks. I appeal to the resolution of any man who has passed through that agony and has sat on that rock at last with a faith and hope and trust no longer traditional, but his own.

That is an impressive recognition of the reality of moral distinctions and of their impelling claim on the human will. These distinctions and this claim are not dependent on theological doctrine, they exist of their own right, and the difference between the ethically religious and all others is that they recognize this—and gladly. Here, indeed, we can today pass beyond Robertson, because we do not see the worth of moral rightness to be something discoverable only as the result of skeptical agony, but as something that should be seen and felt and accepted from the first as essential to true well-being and as a normal source of content with life and joy in its acceptance.

But how is this acceptance to be won in a world where ancient props of morality fall, and it seems as though all moral ideas must go to the melting-pot? Surely by the deepening of moral experience, and by the creation of a civilization in which moral ideas are so integral a part of the common culture that, however they may be challenged, their reality and essential necessity to the common life cannot be escaped. This calls for radical betterment in human relationships of every kind, in the home, the vocation, in citizenship; in the learning to live together on terms of mutual help and encouragement. We live in great part by ideas; we respond readily to social standards, but especially if we have been in contact with them from our earliest days. Do you remember that thrilling moment in Margaret Mitchell's *Gone With the Wind*—a story packed with ethical insights—when Scarlett O'Hara begs Ashley Wilkes to desert his wife, follow what is supposedly his real love, and carry Scarlett away? Shamefacedly the Southern gentleman reminds this Southern girl (whose father may have been a peasant but whose mother was a great lady) that there is something that stands in the way. There's honor! And Scarlett O'Hara is struck dumb. Honor—the idea is part of the common life of these people, whatever otherwise their ideological faults, and even the unscrupulous self-seeker bows to it. And let it not be said that her church dogmas are the necessary basis. Honor, loyalty, responsibility, self-respect, these do not depend on the Virgin Birth, or on Heaven and Hell, or Hierarchies, or the Bible, or even on the sanction of a Deity whom we should respect only as by hypothesis embodying these basic and overarching values. They shine by their own light, and that can be a resplendent one.

The task of our day—as really of all days—is the working out of moral ideas in our civilization so as to make it a matrix of ethical experience. In the practical affairs of life we are used to incentives to greed, to vanity, to vulgarity, and to overcome these, and the moral skepticism that is encouraged by them, we need, with infinite patience and hope, to create attitudes of social helpfulness. How splendid is that home where even the toddling child learns to give his little contribution of glad service, and where the older sons and daughters, unspoiled by parental cravings for crude material successes for their children, grow up as sharers in a community, mutually responsible, reciprocally serviceable, aware by experience of honor, loyalty, honesty, clean living, as factors in a right citizenship to come! How splendid is that business where master and workman have a daily sense of the human importance of their labors, and where the experience of usefulness overtops the expectation of profit! How splendid is that city, that country, whose citizens seek increasingly to establish justice, practice humanity, and organize all means to the common welfare!

What! Stem the tide by these trifling experiments in a home, a workshop, a town? Yes. A devastating skepticism is to be countered not by preaching or teaching—though these may help; not by the weekly hour of Sunday school or release for doctrinal instruction—though even these may be of some assistance; but by *living rightly,* experiencing moral values, learning ideals in the effort to realize them. There is no other way. It may be a slow way. But when was moral advance ever quick? Against all setbacks, even the terrible ones of our own time, we must stand for the permanent worth and potency of right living, and do our share of helping by organization, example, experimentation, no matter how restricted our immediate opportunities, towards the progressive establishment of social and personal righteousness in this our world.

Monotheism Versus Monohumanism

ROBERT WHITAKER

This essay is not concerned with the time or place wherein the idea of monotheism, that is one only and universal God, first entered into the mind of man. The inquiry and the issue here concern the relation in which a unitary idea of God, or of Nature if the impersonal interpretation is preferred, has stood, and does stand today, to a unitary attitude toward humanity. Religion is involved in this inquiry, but science also is in question. Does any unitary concept of the world outside of ourselves, or even including ourselves in a strictly scientific way, carry with it as a sequence a larger catholicity toward humankind as a whole? Is Humanism itself—medieval or modern—philosophical or, in the area of religious rationalism, a guaranty of a more human attitude toward all mankind?

The outstanding exhibit of the progress in religious faith from devotion toward many gods, polytheism, or toward one dominant god who is yet conceived as sharing divinity with other but lesser gods, henotheism, is to be found in the evolution of the religion of Israel. The god who "brought Israel out of Egypt," and is continually referred to in that connection, was evidently a local deity down to David's time, and later. David, compelled to flee from the murderous fury of jealous Saul, and seek refuge in the territory of a foreign king, complains openly that in abandoning the territory of Israel he has abandoned the domain of Israel's god, and is compelled to worship other gods. Elijah, at a later period, when compelled to flee the murderous wrath of Jezebel, resorts to the mountain area where Yahweh has his peculiar abode.

Nowhere in the history of religions is there such drama on so high a scale as the story of the expansion of Israel's faith reveals in the progress from this nascent conception of Omnipotent Power to the god idea which the great Hebrew prophets gave to the world. Not only is there drama in the height of the final achievement to which they attained, but the drama is the more impressive as the steps by which their course was determined are made manifest.

One story, incredible on the face of it, becomes an illuminated pathway to understanding when it is lifted out of the area of wonder and prodigy to the level of historical parable. It is told in the seventh chapter of the Book of Exodus so briefly that it may well be quoted here.

> And Moses and Aaron went in unto Pharaoh, and they did so as the Lord had commanded: and Aaron cast down his rod before Pharaoh, and before his servants, and it became a serpent. Then Pharaoh also called the wise men and the sorcerers: now the magicians of Egypt, they also did in like manner with their enchantments. For they cast down every man his rod, and they became serpents: *but Aaron's rod swallowed up their rods.*

The italics are mine, for it is in these last seven words that we have not only the history of the program of religious expansion in Israel and Judah, but also a parable of that which has happened everywhere in religious evolution. All religions have had the choice between falling before their rivals, or else taking over that which their rivals could give them toward the enlargement and enrichment of their own faith. This process of ingestion goes on with us today to a degree the current orthodoxies are unready to admit.

The Yahweh of nomadic Israel, in their years in the wilderness, did not go down before the agricultural divinities of Canaan although it often appeared on the point of so doing. Nor did the tenacity of Israel's hold upon Yahweh worship fail them when generations later the more serious overwhelming of Israel by the great Empires of Babylonia and Assyria made Yahweh seem as nothing compared with the triumphant gods of heathendom. In both instances the Hebrew prophets rose to the challenge of the hour.

"I girded thee, though thou hast not known me," is the word which the prophet of Israel puts into the mouth of Yahweh, directed to the pagan conqueror of his day. Yahweh defeated? Not so. Yahweh the god of victory, even when the victory is on the side of the enemy! For the enemy's dominion has become the dominion of Yahweh; the enemy's power the power of Yahweh; the defeat of Israel or of Judah, by whomsoever accomplished, merely Yahweh's way of saying that he is not only the one and only God of all the nations, but more, far more, that he is the God of righteousness who can use a Nineveh, a Babylon, a Rome to set forth the requirements of a righteousness upon the part of those who claim to be his own particular people which He will insist upon *though He have to use yet more evil as a chastising rod.*

There has been much of informing discussion within recent years as to the rootage of Israel's faith, and its singular persistence against the floods which again and again throughout the centuries have threatened to sweep it away. The Israelites themselves made no secret of the circumstance wherein their rootage had its tenacious hold. The reference occurs repeatedly in history, prophecy, and psalm, to that supreme experience with which their story as a people began, the deliverance from Egyptian bondage. Whatever question there may be today as to whether this bondage in Egypt included all of the tribes of Israel or only a part of them, or whether in fact there ever were exactly Twelve Tribes, there can be no question as to the profound impression which that experience under the Egyptian taskmasters made upon them, and the extraordinary deliverance which was wrought under the hand of Moses. Even the appeal of the moral code, in the Ten Commandments, is made to rest upon the injunction, "I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage," and this, the one event they might never forget. On this basis Yahweh names himself as peculiarly and preëminently their God.

This would seem to have been basis enough for more than a monotheism on the part of Israel. Here, if anywhere, one would have expected Israel to find place for a monohumanism as far surpassing that of all other religions as the sense of the divine unity to which their prophets rose surpassed the polytheisms of the heathen round about them.

There is nothing to indicate that this was so. Not even their greatest masters of religious thought, Amos, Hosea, Micah, Isaiah, Jeremiah give evidence of identifying religion with a universal fellowship with the disinherited, the oppressed, and those who were in disrepute throughout all the earth. They could rise above adversity, as it pertained to themselves, but always with the confidence that their faith would be justified with

a final prosperity of undeniable glory. The Book of Job, which rises to a height beyond any other ancient drama, in its challenge of adversity as evidence of disfavor with God, ends in a traditional "happy ending" of the uttermost improbability, as weak as that which any second-rate novelist of today could use.

Much of my childhood and youth were spent in Waltham, Massachusetts, where I attended first of all the infant class in the First Baptist Church, in which I was later baptized and ordained. I recall distinctly that over the pulpit platform, in large characters, these words were engraved: "They shall prosper that love Thee." The Hebrew prophets knew that this was not always so. But always they were inclined to charge the delinquency of material prosperity to moral delinquency as its prelude and explanation. Even in their adversities good people were IT in the thought and purpose of the Almighty. "They shall prosper" sometime, somewhere, "that love Thee."

It is at this point that our own monotheism, personal or impersonal, must be tested today. Are we any less sure that we are the chosen people of God today than were the Hebrew prophets yesterday? Are we less insistent upon "prosperity" as the sign royal for respectable association? Out of whatever "pits" we "have been digged" are we less inclined to assert the self-made philosophy and draw around us the robes of a self-righteous satisfaction, or of a mild admission that we have not quite lived up to that superiority which by right is ours?

Somehow, when going back to the ancient days, we are inclined also to make more of this spirit on the part of the Pharisees than with respect to the Sadducees, the religious rationalists of the day. Yet Jesus warned his disciples against them both. "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and the Sadducees." The disciples thought that by the word "leaven" he meant bread. The mistake was not altogether a mistake. It was at the point of bread and butter they were, and are, so utterly alike. Is it not at this point also that theists and humanists, yes, even atheists, are alike in their failure to translate whatever monisms they accept, as to "Nature" or "God" into monohumanism?

Not so very long ago the leading representative of the Southern Baptist Convention made a tour of the churches in the Northern Baptist Convention. In one of the citadels of Baptist faith in the Empire State a banquet was set forth to which this devoutly orthodox Christian leader of the South was invited as an honored guest. Like invitations had been graciously accepted on his part. But when he learned that the presiding official of the Baptist Ministerial Union in that particular city, who would thereby preside at the banquet, was a Negro, like Peter at Antioch who dared not commune with the uncircumcized Christians of that Northern Church, this man refused the fellowship of the table lest he become anathema among his home brethren. Paul "withstood Peter to the face," but not so was any protest voiced on this occasion.

Would it have been otherwise had the gathering been a humanist gathering, an atheist gathering, or a gathering of scientists, with their theoretical monisms as to the natural universe? Possibly! But I am not at all certain that Negroes are any more welcome among the non-theistic monists than among the orthodox monists, if asked to challenge the Mason and Dixon line.

There is no room for pride on the part of any of us here. There is no security where we seem most secure. No excuse that we can offer for refraining from making this unity of all humanity our first business above all other concerns can guarantee us that any one thing with which we concern ourselves now is going to stand. All our theologies, all our philosophies, all our sciences, all our arts, all our very sports, in which it would sometimes appear we are more international than are churchmen—all and everything, we are being forced to admit, hangs upon the issue as to whether we are going to make monohumanism the law of life. Be as monotheistic as you please, and how you please, but it is all sounding brass and clanging cymbal unless even "love" is lifted above poetic and philosophic personal definition, and flows from man to man in a monohumanism which covers the earth as the waters cover the sea.

Tried in the Balance

ARTHUR D. WEAGE

What a chaos of conflict our present world presents! Humanity seems almost at the end of its rope, at the last ditch, the final impasse. Surely there must soon be sudden turning or certain ruin! One of the most tragic facts we face is the knowledge that even our worldly wise men whom we have so long looked up to and trusted seem utterly unable to read the signs of the times, unable to decipher the handwriting on the wall, unable to delay the downward drift toward chaos.

But yet, has there ever in recorded history been a world crisis where the great, the powerful, the rich and cultured of mankind have been able to read aright the signs of their own time, to understand the fateful warning words, until the final impasse is at hand, the old wine-skins are nigh to bursting, and the debacle of despair yawns beneath their feet?

No, our wise and powerful ones, our leaders, those whose hands are on the levers of control, the wealth, the culture and prestige, the government, the military might and all the rest, have managed our affairs, have had their will and way, and have it still—with what result? "Confusion worse confounded," a world armed to the teeth; the earth, the sky, the sea, and even underneath the waves and earth filled with ghastly instruments of death, and multitudes of military-minded men quaking still in abject fear; a world of persecution, intolerance, and hate, a world of billionaires and starving millions. Truly the wisdom of our wisemen has perished and we must seek elsewhere for salvation.

Is there any way out? Certainly there is. And just as certainly the way out is not a new way. It is as old as, and older than, the time when the Chaldean soothsayers and magicians were called in to read the mysterious words of doom and ignominiously failed, and the troublesome and unpopular prophet Daniel

read them: "Thou art tried in the balance and found wanting." Whether this old Chaldean tale be fact or fancy matters little to us, what does matter is that it is true to lite, true to human experience, just as true today as thousands of years ago.

It has always been true, and is today, that when human institutions, governments, churches, social systems, get about so far on the evolutionary climb, they lose something of virility, of moral stamina, and a sort of spiritual creeping paralysis sets in. They become crippled, hidebound, by their old orthodox status quo and by little piffling outmoded customs and ceremonies, and when they get just about so far on the wrong trail, some of the inescapable moral laws of the universe crack down and they are compelled willy-nilly to "right about face."

This means revolution, "believe it or not," like it or not. O how we good comfortable respectable folks do hate and fear, deny and dodge, misinterpret and misunderstand this word revolution! But make no mistake, it is a word which it behooves us in this day to become better acquainted with, for our world today is on the verge of just such a crisis and faces inevitable revolutionary change. Like all times of crisis, our own day has its prophets, radicals, revolutionists, rebels, and they are still despised and rejected of men. But in spite of the fact that radicals and revolutionists, good, bad, and indifferent, violent and non-violent, are in this very day so hated, feared, and hounded over the earth, nay even because of this fact, our leaders and overlords, in fact all of us if we are wise, will not angrily and stupidly stop our ears to their message as they interpret for us the warning of the handwriting on the wall. For there is in these times no more desperate need and demand than a double measure of a truly radical revolutionary spirit which will startle and shake men out of their leaden lethargy to the appalling evils and the boundless opportunities of the present hour, and spur them to action.

The very fact that so many men of revolutionary spirit are found in all parts of the world today, and that they are so feared, maligned, and lied about is significant; it is no mere chance; it means that there is need. Revolutionists are not born revolutionists, they are produced by their environment. Wherever and whenever society becomes corrupt, artificial, shackled by extreme wealth or poverty, power or tyranny, revolutionists are born, or sent as part of the moral order of the universe to save society from utter ruin.

The revolutionary spirit is a normal reaction of a sensitive unperverted human being to things and conditions he sees and feels and knows to be wrong, dangerous and unjust, and that he knows can be made right. The revolutionist may not be a well-balanced and developed character, he may be narrow, faulty, crude, and uncultured, but he is one who in some way is able to read the signs of the times and is obsessed with a flaming spirit of devotion, courage, and self-sacrifice that knows no defeat.

There should be no shame attached to the words *radical, revolution, revolutionist;* rather should they be a badge of honor in a time when indifference, falsehood, corruption in high places are rampant, when a mockery is made of human brotherhood, when there is starvation in the midst of plenty. The greatest and finest characters of mankind have been inspired by a revolutionary spirit. The whole history of the early Christian Church as recorded in the New Testament is a thrilling account of the impact of the revolutionary ideas, words, and deeds of the early Christians on the social life and institutions of their times. And with good reason was their message a revolutionary one, for Jesus, their teacher, master, and example, was the one supreme realist, radical, and revolutionist of all time. He was a realist because He was a radical and probed to the very roots of human personality. He was a non-violent revolutionist because non-violence taps those sources of power that violence cannot touch.

It was this revolutionary spirit that shocked and angered the respectables and orthodox of the status quo in state and church. It was this revolutionary spirit that caused them to persecute and finally hound him and his disciples to death, and it was this same spirit that caused the common people to hear him gladly. Without this radical spirit of revolution it is doubtful if the early Christians would ever have been heard of a few generations after their master had been shamefully crucified between two criminals. As it was, these early Christians became known as those who "turned the world upside down"—not a bad definition for revolutionists.

When the Church lost its revolutionary spirit, it lost its peculiar power over individual lives and social institutions. Who can claim that the Christian church today is coming to grips in any adequate way with the desperate problems of our day and world? Can there be any doubt that the reason is that she is not inspired by the revolutionary spirit of her Lord?

What our churches need, what our world needs and must have and have quickly if we escape world chaos, is not, I am convinced, as some good people would have us believe, to muzzle, to get rid of, export, jail or hang the radicals, the rebels, and the revolutionists of the world, warped and bad as some of them are; what our confused, warring, apathetic world needs is (shocking though it may sound) more revolutionists and more revolutionary revolutionists—not bombing revolutionists, not firing-squad revolutionists, but revamped, regenerated, non-violent revolutionists, for nothing less searching, nothing less powerful, uprooting, and overturning than such a revolutionary spirit can heal and save a civilization as sick as our own.

If our Christian churches, with such a revolutionary background and leader as Jesus, such a revolutionary Magna Charta as the Sermon on the Mount, cannot train, inspire, and send forth some such revolutionary spirits in our day, surely they are failing to meet a supreme opportunity of our age. The situation of our good Christian people today seems not unlike that of those very devout and religious exemplars of orthodoxy, the Pharisees, who were scandalized at the words and works of Jesus.

They were too frozen in their proud self-righteous orthodoxy to comprehend and accept Jesus' revolutionary message, and the tragic result was that these models of religious respectability were the one class Jesus failed almost completely to reach. They were the one group who wrung from his gentle lips some of the most scathing denunciations ever uttered; and Jesus was finally compelled to tell them that the social outcasts they so despised were nearer to the Kingdom than they.

God forbid that the day should come when He must seek elsewhere than in the church for the revolutionary spirits to hasten the coming of His Kingdom, and that there should be writ across the altars of lukewarm and apathetic churches—"tried in the balance and found wanting."

On the Pacifist Front

[UNITY will publish from time to time, under this heading, such news as can be gathered about pacifists and pacifist activities in these war days. We earnestly invite our readers to send us such items of interest as may come to their attention.—*Editor.*]

XXII

Dr. Elmore M. M'Kee, successor to the famous Dr. Rainsford as Rector of St. George's Church, New York, publishes in the New York *Herald-Tribune* a letter on the role of the church in war. The letter follows, in part:

The role of the Church in the present crisis should be understood. It does not identify the eternal city of God with any temporal city of man. When the Visigoth Alaric conquered Christian Rome in 410, St. Augustine began to write the *City of God* to persuade the Church not to identify Christianity with any city or civilization.

So today strong groups within the Church are less concerned with force of arms than with forgiveness of sins as a means toward peace; less certain of the country's need for that "inventory of skills" called conscription than for some great widening of the area of such experiments in good will and social justice as are now being carried on by the Quakers.

They suspect that war may be a kind of a mass retreat from reality, a way of "all going crazy together" instead of all keeping our heads together; they honor the conscientious objector to war who was in the majority in pre-Constantine days and is coming back into power in all communions in these latter days; they ask the Church not to pray for victory for any side but that God may somehow bring good out of current evil; they resist the kind of nationalism within the Church which is an easy escape from the necessity of inventing "some great new enterprise"; they hold fast to the supranational (not super-national) character of the Universal Church, even in days of acute divisions, knowing that if they surrender that they have allowed the Church to become little more than the religious portion of the nation's cheering section.

"Aldrig mere Krig" (No More War) is the Danish Section of the War Resisters International. This group of pacifists are continuing to publish their paper in Denmark. The May number, which reached England, has been translated and published by the War Resisters headquarters in London, and reveals contents "written without fear, with a superb courage, a high idealism and practical wisdom." In an introduction to this pamphlet, the English translator says:

"Aldrig mere Krig" is the Danish Section of the International. It is not only, in proportion to the small population of Denmark, the largest section—it is the most highly developed in the technique of war resistance. It has earned the respect of a nation.

The day came when our comrades and the whole nation were to be put to the test. Denmark was invaded. The Danish army was ordered not to fight. The uninvited and unwelcome guest found a people inspired by a new courage —the courage which looks reality in the face and takes its decision with a quiet determination, which has patience and the quality of being able to hold out and is not broken.

The technique of resistance, held as a theory by "Aldrig mere Krig," has become the practical policy of a nation.

The Danish paper contains an article written by H. Jonassen, President of the "Aldrig mere Krig." This article, written and published under the German occupation, is as follows:

It was a sad awakening for us all on April 9th. We had hoped until the last to remain free of the "protection" of others. The consoling feature was that the Government had the good sense and the courage to give instructions that the Army should not be employed. We cannot thank the Minister of State and the Minister for Foreign Affairs enough for the courage they showed in this.

At this point it would also be appropriate to express appreciation of the discipline which was shown by the chiefs of the Army and by all the Authorities. We understand how hard it must have been for people who have considered it their task to create a usable army, to refrain from using it at the critical moment. It is the expression of a high degree of self-control which cannot fail to compel respect, and it is quite wrong to say, as certain quarters have said, that the Army had failed in its duty. It is the Government elected by the people which decides whether the Army shall be used, and not the Army itself.

That a defense of the Danish Army should appear in our paper is a thing one would have thought impossible. But much has changed since the last issue appeared, and we must all learn to adapt ourselves to the new circumstances. The many new regulations which have been issued affect our activities intimately. Such is the case, for instance, with the prohibition of all public meetings and demonstrations. And now follows a statement which no one would have expected to find in the paper:

"It must be impressed in the most decisive manner on all members that these regulations are to be strictly observed. No public demonstration, whether verbal or in the form of the distribution of leaflets, and whether addressed to civil or military persons, may be held. Anyone who fails to understand this will soon regret it, and great harm may be done to our cause."

Circumstances made it necessary to call off the Annual General Meeting. The planned Summer Camp is also called off, and "Nordisk Fredsforlag" (the Scandinavian Peace Publishers) are suspending their activities until further notice. The election of the "Hovedbestyrelse" (National Council) is also abandoned. A decision regarding the monthly organ will be arrived at later. It would be desirable to maintain it as a link between us. Among other considerations will be that of finance. Groups are therefore urged particularly to have their subscriptions always paid up to date.

Other tasks? What, have we other tasks at present? Undoubtedly. We constantly desire to exercise an influence for peace. The country is now occupied by a so-called "enemy." We must be among those who understand that they are people like us, but torn from their home-surroundings, their homes, their relations, and their friends, and set down among strangers and uncertain of what the future offers. They are certainly not to be envied. It is no task for us Danes to put aside human feelings in relation to these numerous strangers, and I am convinced that, as the days pass, it will be more and more necessary to try to call forth, by love, the human attributes of our compatriots. We have here a task which is absolutely in accord with our objects.

Otherwise the future is so uncertain that it is hardly possible to say anything further today. Perhaps we shall pass through very difficult days before the war is over, and what the times will be like afterwards nobody knows. But we must always hold high the demand for a just peace to all sides, and hope that the promises which have been given, that there will be no interference with the internal conditions of our country, will be kept, so that some time, under different circumstances, we may be able to resume our work in its entirety.

The Canadian Government has officially exempted Doukhobors and Mennonites from military conscription because of their religious scruples against bearing arms and shedding blood. Members of the Canadian Legion have protested this ruling.

The *Christian Century,* indispensable in this crisis, publishes the following from its Cincinnati correspondent:

Each Protestant minister in Cincinnati received a few weeks ago a letter signed by several representative clergymen. "Are you among those," it asked, "who believe in the positive pacifist position and do you wish to be known as belonging to the Christian conscientious objectors to war? Are you willing to meet with others of like mind to think through together just what ought to be said and done in the impending emergency?" Fifty-six ministers answered affirmatively and several fellowship meetings have already been held.

Dr. Walter C. Woodward, editor of the *American Friend,* speaks for the Quakers, and for all pacifists, in the following statement on the conscription issue:

> We share with all others a concern about the welfare of our country, but we feel that military conscription undermines the principle of liberty for which this country has stood for many years. As for ourselves we seek no special privileges. . . . We want provisions made so that conscientious objectors may be respected, with a government department free of military domination designated to pass on claims of those who have conscientious objections to military service.

The *New Republic* publishes a plea for conscientious objectors by Rufus Horton Jones and his wife, Ruth Fosdick Jones. They write:

> If the present European war draws this country into conflict abroad, the number of objectors to conscription for war service will probably increase tenfold. This estimate is more than borne out in England today. Of the men called to fight, one out of fifty has claimed exemption as a conscientious objector to war. In the World War, the proportion was approximately one to 560.

The authors urge that conscientious objectors, whether on religious or political grounds, be permitted to refuse both combatant and non-combatant service. As an alternative, they suggest that the objectors "be permitted to set themselves up in coöperative subsistence projects."

The Burke-Wadsworth Bill for peacetime military conscription, as adopted by the Senate, contained the following provisions for the treatment of conscientious objectors:

> Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to require any person to be subject to combatant training or service in the land or naval forces of the United States who, by reason of religious training and belief, is conscientiously opposed to participation in war in any form. All persons claiming such exemption from combatant training and service because of such conscientious objections shall be listed on a register of conscientious objectors at the time of their classification by a local board, and the names of the persons so registered shall be at once referred by such local board to the Department of Justice for inquiry and hearing.
>
> After appropriate inquiry by the proper agency of the Department of Justice, a hearing shall be held by the Department of Justice in the case of each such person with respect to the character and good faith of his objections, and such person shall be notified of the time and place of such hearing. The Department shall, after such hearing, if the objections are found to be sustained, recommend (1) that the objector shall be assigned to non-combatant service as defined by the President, or (2) if the objector is found to be conscientiously opposed to participation in such non-combatant service, that he shall be assigned to work of national importance under civilian direction.
>
> If, after such hearing, the objections of any such person are found not to be sustained, the objector and the local board shall be immediately notified thereof, the name of the objector shall then be removed from the register of conscientious objectors, and such objector shall thereafter be liable to training and service as provided by this act. If, within five days after the date of such findings by the Department of Justice, the objector or the local board gives notice to the other of disagreement with such findings, the local board shall immediately refer the matter for final determination to an appropriate appeal board established pursuant to Section 10 (A) (2).

It is expected that these provisions will be adopted by the House of Representatives. Any changes which may be made in the final form of the Bill will be reported in this column. (See editorial comment in this issue.)

Trumpets on New Horizons

September, 1939-1940—?

This is the worst defeat,
This the thoughtless way.
And fifty years from now
There will be men who say,
"These were our fathers
And themselves and us they killed,
Because they would not know,
Being human, self-willed—
(Even a child should know,
Even the rank beginners)—
That never in a war
Are there any winners.
The fruitless battle done,
Conqueror and vanquished lie
Together underground,
And overhead hawks fly,
While we the harvest reap,
Who would be peaceful men,
Of hate, distrust, and fear,"
And go to war again.

DOROTHY E. SPARKS.

Singer, Ease the Heart!

Great is the need for song these stricken days.
Slashed with the scythe of greedy war and shame,
Our people cry for joyful roundelays
To ease the hearts grown sick of the ghastly game
That's played too long by warlord profiteers.
Do these not shrivel at groans of maimed and blind?
Are they not doomed by every orphan's tears
Who feast and toss the poor a bitter rind?
Our people need the singers who rally hope,
Who reaffirm the simple truth we know,
Who glorify the sun and mountain slope,
The moth-flowers pale as softly driven snow.
Let us have singers who shall bravely raise
Our baffled eyes to vision, hearts to praise.

IRENE KIRBY SURENSON.

Rise!

Truth that died on the cross
For stirring the souls of men,
See how the wood is shaped
Into a cross again.

Truth that died in the van
For bread on earth, good will,
See in the name of truth
How the truth again they kill.

O burned and hanged and shot,
O truth in the souls of men,
Roll the stone from the tomb,
Rise from the grave again!

HENRY GEORGE WEISS.

The Amazing Plan

We delve in mountains of books to find
  Cures for the ills of humankind;
Ills which are bred in hovel and slum,
  Or rise from war like filthy scum.
Delving we miss the amazing plan:
  The cause and cure of pain is—man.

NATALIE T. MORRIS.

The Study Table

The Real Roosevelt

COUNTRY SQUIRE IN THE WHITE HOUSE. *By John T. Flynn. New York: Doubleday, Doran & Company.* 122 *pp.* $1.00.

One of the mysteries of this age, to be solved, we hope, by the historians of the future, is that of the adulation and uncritical support poured forth upon Franklin D. Roosevelt by the liberals of this country. I have myself never shared this adulation or given this support. I have recognized the personal charm, good intentions, and generous popular sympathies of the President. I know that his administration is to be credited with certain social achievements that are memorable; that Washington, during the past seven years, has had a higher type of governmental personnel than the city has seen since the great days of Theodore; that Mr. Roosevelt has done more for labor than any other dozen presidents. But I have never believed that the President's ideas or achievements were his own, that he had either knowledge, vision, or ordered thought, or that his boasted New Deal—illogical, inconsistent, empty, pretentious—was anything *in toto* but a flat failure. In these later years, with the world plunging into chaos, I have come reluctantly to feel that the President's headship of the nation is highly dangerous, since his overweening ambition, self-confidence, and love of power are matched by nothing quite so much as his irresponsibility. Yet through all these years, the liberals, even the radicals, have acclaimed the man in the White House, supported him in his campaigns, and styled him the greatest president since Lincoln. And it has been lonely business, in UNITY and elsewhere, to register my dissent.

Hence the comfort I feel in reading and commending this book by John T. Flynn, great American economist, ardent democrat, liberal of liberals, an editor of the *New Republic,* a man as far removed from the influences of conservatism and reaction in this country as any of the President's devotees. Mr. Flynn has never swallowed the New Deal bait—for years he has been in furious opposition to the naïve idol-worship of his colleagues on the *New Republic* staff. And now, in these pages, he states his case. His book is, in effect, a brief for the prosecution. Rooseveltian "yes men" have called it prejudiced, biased, savagely unbridled in its denunciations. It is nothing of the kind! The book is a serious and sober marshalling of facts, relentless only in its accuracy, precision, and understanding; and an interpretation of the meaning of these facts. Mr. Flynn sees things as they are, and puts them on the canvas as he sees them. If the result is devastating, an exposé such as no President has met in his time at the hands not of a political opponent but of a scholarly historical observer, the fault is not Mr. Flynn's but the President's. No man can be blamed for reading the record.

The chief value of this book, to my mind, is just this record. What we have here is not so much a personal study of an historical figure à la Strachey, as the presentation of an era. What stands out is not so much the personality, F. D. R., as the background against which this personality is projected. The fantastic character of this background would be incredible if it were not for the chapters and verses here scrupulously set down—the promises made only to be broken, the policies announced only to be abandoned, the chimeras followed to complete frustration and disastrous defeat, the first, second, third New Deals each utterly contradictory of the others, the continuing chaos of administrative and public affairs, the unfailing witchery of words to cover up ill-fated deeds, the failure which has marked two administrations through more than seven years to accomplish anything to lift the depression and save the nation. If a reader would see Mr. Flynn at his best in his analysis of Rooseveltian policies at their worst, we advise him to read the story of the N. R. A. as here set forth.

But of course the fascination of the book lies primarily in its character study of one of the four or five outstanding personalities of our time—the President of the United States in the most terrific period of modern history. Here again Mr. Flynn's work is chiefly a statement of facts, and only incidentally an interpretation of these facts. What he shows is a boy born to ease and luxury, from the first a petted, pampered, and rigorously controlled "mother's darling," who grew to manhood through courses of education in which he had little interest and did little work. Neither in college, profession, or politics, did he achieve anything or excel in anything. From the beginning he leaned upon other men for his knowledge, of which he gathered little for himself, for his ideas, of which he never had any of his own, for his speeches and state papers, of which he wrote only the incidental and less important. "The speeches were not written by the President any more than the speeches uttered by an actor on the stage are the product of his pen. It would be as proper to praise Mr. Walter Hampden for his magnificent poetic gifts because of the noble verses he utters in *Hamlet.*" What Mr. Roosevelt excelled in was an openness of mind, a willingness to listen to any proposal that sounded attractive, an eagerness to try any scheme that promised success, a jaunty, careless, confident venturesomeness, a puckish love of the unusual and sensational, which have combined to make the era of Roosevelt II one of the most exciting in all American history. Nobody but a Roosevelt could have attacked the Supreme Court as he did, and in the way he did. The result has been such a merry-go-round as this country has never known. It cannot be understood at all, says Mr. Flynn, unless one remembers that Mr. Roosevelt has never been thinking and acting for himself, but only impersonating and dramatizing the latest adviser who has won his confidence.

The latter portion of this book is a study of the President's war policy. Mr. Flynn declares that "the President has gone to war"; and makes no bones in declaring that he is dragging the nation into the European struggle, partly because this is the latest sensation, but primarily because it is the one thing left to postpone the complete and final collapse of the New Deal. Added to this is "the President's long, constant attitude toward armaments and military training. He is a lover of arms." It is on this note that the author ends his treatise:

> Politics, vacillation, the eternal straining after cleverness, a mind . . . open at both ends, through which all sorts of half-baked ideas flow, love of the spectacular . . . good intentions mixed with confused ethical concepts—these have brought the President to the tragic point where the only thing that can save his regime is to take the country off into a war hysteria.

Seven years after he took office there are eleven million unemployed, private investment is dead, the farm problem is precisely where he found it. He put through some social reforms that the country was yelling for. But these social reforms have to be almost completely overhauled. The cost of all this has been twenty-two billion dollars all yet to be paid.

If it has all happened that way, it is because Franklin D. Roosevelt is that way.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Psalms in Modern Dress

THE LYRIC PSALTER. *Edited by Dr. Harry H. Mayer. New York: Liveright Publishing Corporation.* 384 *pp.* $3.00.

PEACE NOW! *Foothill Poets, 923 E. Mountain Street, Pasadena, California.* 16 *pp.* 15 *cents.*

SENOR PACO DOES NOT RETURN. *By Miriam Crenshaw. Santa Barbara, California: J. F. Rowney Press.* $1.50.

A monumental book of beauty and power proven by the ages and now magnificently recreated by the genius of today to help tomorrow create civilization out of chaos—such terms would be absurd overstatement of almost any other book on earth and yet, allowing for the demonstrated uncertainty of all prophecy, they seem to us a conservatively accurate description of *The Lyric Psalter.*

Let us add the subtitle, "The Modern Reader's Book of Psalms" and the explanation that here for the first time is a translation into modern poetry of the psalms, and that the publishers seem to us quite correct in stating, "over sixty of the world's greatest poets have collaborated to give a modern interpretation . . . acknowledged masters of their craft have attained grace and beauty of form combined with accuracy and vigor." (There are exceptions, including your reviewer, but there are also poems by Lord Dunsany, W. H. Auden, Witter Bynner, William Ellery Leonard, John Oxenham, Eunice Tietjens, and many another major constellation.) Then you may see why we recommend this book as being more valuable for every modern Christian church than a pulpit.

Yet there is still another reason. It is that creators are never content to stop creating. The poets have not merely translated the psalms into rhyme and meter. They have added, and what they have added makes this psalter a more profoundly spiritual, inclusively social, contribution to the literature of wonder and worship than was the old. This is especially evident where several modern versions appear of the same psalm.

That "Peace on earth" is a program as well as a prophecy, a method as well as a goal, to the poets is proven once again, this time by *Peace Now!,* a brochure of anti-war poems by members of the Foothill Poets branch of the Western Poets Congress, whose slogan until the war is over is: "Poets May Be Nuts but NOT in the War Machine." We quote one verse from this attractive, significant pamphlet:

> Hurrah for the war in which I'll enlist,
> Where the bankers are smack in the van,
> Where not a mill by the draft is missed
> But there's never conscripted a man,
>
> Where the people retain complete control
> With freedom of speech and of thought,
> Hurrah for the war in which I'll enroll,
> The war that will never be fought!

Senor Paco Does Not Return, well-intentioned verse by Miriam Crenshaw—a mild idealist and gentle nonconformist whose hero is Don Quixote and whose technique is not modern either—strikes an occasional high note that makes one eager to see more matured work of hers.

RALPH CHEYNEY.

BOOK NOTES

Intertestamental Literature

THE STORY OF THE APOCRYPHA. *By Edgar J. Goodspeed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.* 150 *pp.* $2.00.

Professor Goodspeed was the first to translate the Apocrypha into modern English from the Greek original. This he accomplished last year with the exception of Second Esdras which, aside from a few verses found in an Oxyrhynchus parchment leaf, survives only in an early Latin translation. *The Apocrypha, an American Translation,* was an instant success, and this has prompted Professor Goodspeed to write a primer for those who would know this portion of a large body of intertestamental literature. The Apocrypha are the fourteen books which in old pulpit Bibles stand between the Old and New Testaments. They are First and Second Esdras (Ezra), Tobit, Judith, the rest of Esther, Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, Susanna, the Song of the Three Children, Bel and the Dragon, The Prayer of Manasseh, and First and Second Maccabees. The Story of the Apocrypha tells in a simple and elementary manner how these books were dropped from most Bibles as they are generally used today. But the Apocrypha are coming back into Bibles. Professor Goodspeed is to be congratulated for the latest complete Bible which has in the past few weeks come into general use. This includes the Old and New Testaments with the Apocrypha between them as Martin Luther grouped them in 1534 and as Coverdale put them into the English Version the following year. Not until we read the complete Bible can we understand its entire message. Many of the ideas and teachings taken for granted in the New Testament arose in the intertestamental period. Professor Goodspeed's *Story of the Apocrypha* is a much needed book, and a careful study of its pages will make the Bible more intelligible and more appreciated.

The Forces of the Reformation

A COMPEND OF THE INSTITUTES OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION BY JOHN CALVIN. *Edited by Hugh Thomson Kerr, Jr. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.* 228 *pp.* $2.50.

John Calvin gathered together the forces of the Reformation. His classic work, *The Institutes of the Christian Religion,* in the 1559 edition, states the whole matter in Calvin's own words: "My design in this work has been to prepare and qualify students of theology for the reading of the divine word, that they may have an easy introduction to it, and be enabled to proceed in it without any obstruction." From that time to this, the *Institutes* have been translated, read, and debated. Not always have students found the two heavy volumes "an easy introduction." There have been many compends, at least ten in various languages. This compend is, to all practical purposes, the best ever published. Historically, whether one claims a place in the Reformed Church or not, he should know the *Institutes.* The early religious and cultural life of America found its nourishment in the Calvinistic system. It should also be remembered that the earliest French edition

set the form for what came to be literary French. Scholars in the field of history and literature as well as theologians in the Presbyterian system of churches owe Professor Kerr a great debt of gratitude.

Ministerial Case Work

A PERSON-MINDED MINISTRY. *By Richard Henry Edwards. Nashville: The Cokesbury Press.* $2.00.

This book is a call away from mechanism to personalism. Meant primarily for pastors, it states that the supreme requirement for those who are working with men and women is to see them as "persons with attitudes, prejudices, hopes and fears, hates and loves, hidden motivations, deep desires, and mysterious flashes of insight." The minister, the social worker, and the teacher must find out how persons have become as they are. This, of course, is difficult and demands great patience. In this particular time there is more need for personal case work than perhaps ever before. Ministers must be better trained for pastoral work. The last chapter, "Preparation for a Person-Minded Ministry," is worth the price of the book. The author brings challenging figures from May's report on the preparation for the ministry: "Less than half of the Protestant white ministers in America have had college training." This matter ought to receive the most urgent attention in all branches of the church. All who are interested in theological training must read this book.

CHARLES A. HAWLEY.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 18)

The Committee's road has not been easy. Besides the staggering organizational problem, it has been handicapped by the necessity of interpreting and applying the United States immigration laws, certainly not designed to facilitate easy entry into this country. Through the pressure of unavoidable circumstances, it has found itself in the unenviable position of having to rescue first the children of the comparatively wealthy. As one bitterly clairvoyant woman remarked to a Committee interviewer: "I see—it's them that has the money that gets in!" The Committee has also found itself discriminating in practice if not in intent in favor of children actually in England. But worst of all, the Committee has had to bear the blame for the appalling dearth of shipping facilities. Unless perhaps American ships are sent (the wisdom of which move is at best debatable), it is chimerical to hope that more than a few hundred children a month can be brought to the United States or Canada in the near future. For this the war, the blockade, and British policy—not the Committee—are responsible.

During the first three weeks of its existence, the Committee was in practice restricted to a single task: advising individuals how to fill out and send affidavits and supporting documents in the usual complicated procedure for a permanent visa. No visitors' visas had been granted since the beginning of the war, the only concession made by the authorities being a new method of cabling the affidavits instead of sending them by mail to the consul abroad, which materially affected the speed but not the substance of the transaction.

In the meantime the British plan to evacuate children to Canada and the other dominions, based on the laudable proposition of taking a cross-section of the population and emphasizing working-class children, had broken down under the jolt received by the torpedoing of the *Arandora Star,* reportedly only twelve hours ahead of a ship full of evacuated children. To meet this new situation, and to silence growing criticism, the American immigration authorities suddenly announced on July 13 that the normal procedure would be materially simplified and speeded up. Visitors' visas were to be granted, and it would be possible for groups of children to come in under a new "corporate affidavit." Orders went to consuls abroad to supply a combination of visitors' and permanent visas so that 10,000 children should be in possession of them in excess of current shipping facilities.

A sigh of relief went up from the general public, always intolerant of technicalities. It seemed that all problems were solved. But the Committee found itself faced with tremendously increased responsibilities in return for comparatively minor changes in fundamental procedure. In fact so drastic were the changes brought about in its work by the new announcement that the Committee was obliged to close its doors for a week of feverish consultation and reorganization, out of which it emerged with a clear conception of its new position and an organization geared to handle the new responsibilities. And almost at once it was able to announce a first success: on July 24th the first contingent of 104 children and 22 mothers crossed the Canadian frontier under a Committee affidavit and opened the way for others to take advantage of the new group procedure.

Available to alien children under sixteen seeking safety from war and to a limited number of accompanying relatives, the new arrangement is basically as follows: The United States Committee for the Care of European Children may assure the immigration authorities that children will not become public charges and will be cared for according to standards of the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor. On the basis of this assurance the consul may grant visas without requiring personal affidavits. To back up its assurance, the Committee must secure from individuals desiring to sponsor children satisfactory affidavits of support, and must set up an insurance fund of $50 per child—contributed as far as possible by sponsors but supplemented by donated funds when necessary. Before accepting the homes offered, it must have them inspected and approved by designated child welfare agencies, which will continue to keep them under supervision throughout the child's stay.

Thus, although sponsors may now deal directly with the Committee in this country instead of having to deal at long range with consuls abroad, the new scheme does not fundamentally alter the situation—press ballyhoo to the contrary. Sponsors must still present legal evidence of their ability to support the child—and the Committee's requirements are of necessity fairly high. Although the new regulations permit entry of children without awaiting the quota, this does not affect British children, whose quota had never been filled, while its advantage for European children from countries with already over-subscribed quotas is practically nullified by the additional requirement that they show ability and intent to leave the country after the war.

It is difficult to assess relative values in an emergency. The Committee may be snuffed out overnight if the predicted Blitzkrieg shuts off the flow of children to this country, or if a sudden peace makes their coming unnecessary. But if it is permitted to do so, it is in an excellent position to perform really useful service for the helpless children whose plight has so strikingly caught the imagination of America.

Nofrontier News Service.

A Statement

The action of the Board of Directors of the American Civil Liberties Union in removing from membership on the Board Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, an official of the Communist Party, has been approved by a majority of the members of the National Committee of the Union. Miss Flynn's membership on the Board therefore ceased on August 12, 1940.

Miss Flynn's removal from the Board followed her refusal to resign upon the request of the Board, and the subsequent filing of charges by three Board members. One charge held that she was disqualified for further membership under the resolution adopted at the annual meeting of the Union, holding it "inappropriate" for any supporter of dictatorship to serve on the Union's governing committees or staff. The other two charges related to articles by Miss Flynn in Communist publications scoring the Civil Liberties Union, in one of which she stated:

> I don't mind being expelled by this kind of people. I don't belong with them anyhow. I'll fight them to expose them, not from a desire to associate with them any longer. Labor can defend its own civil liberties—so can the Communists, without the A. C. L. U.
>
> —*A. C. L. U. Bulletin*